names *Belemnites* and *Passaloteuthis*, and reached the same conclusions as Doyle & Riegraf have more recently. In particular, I agree that it would not be possible to designate a type specimen of *'Belemnites paxillosa'* that would not add to confusion, whereas *Passaloteuthis bruguieranus* (d'Orbigny, 1843) has been widely accepted since the work of Lissajous in 1915. I do not support the use of *Belemnites* as a generic name, any more than I would the analogous names *Ammonites*, *Trilobites* and *Graptolites*.

Reference

Saks, V. N. & Nal'nyaeva, T. I. 1970. *Early and Middle Jurassic belemnites of the northern part of the U.S.S.R.* 228 pp. Leningrad. [In Russian].

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Conus floridanus* Gabb, 1869 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)

(Case 2563: see BZN **44**: 21–22)

M. G. Harasewych & R. E. Petit
National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.

We wish to express our opposition to Cernohorsky's proposed conservation of the specific name *floridanus* Gabb, 1869, as this would require the use of the plenary powers to suppress the senior synonym *Conus anabathrum* Crosse, 1865, a taxon that was validly proposed in a major malacological journal, was adequately illustrated, and for which a holotype exists and has always been available for study in a museum noted for its care and curation of type material. Vink (1985, p. 3) gives a history of the names involved, and makes it clear that previous misidentifications of *Conus anabathrum* Crosse stem from an initial misidentification by Smith (1884, p. 489), which was cited by Tomlin (1937, p. 211). Tomlin's listing in a catalogue of species-level names of *Conus*, not intended to be a taxonomic revision, was blindly accepted by later workers. Evidently, the first recent workers to examine the holotype of *Conus anabathrum* were Coomans, Moolenbeek & Wils (1980, p. 34), who recognised this taxon as a senior synonym of *Conus floridanus*.

Nomenclatural stability may be achieved by the strict application of the rule of priority or by the conserving of a 'metastable' species name, one used incorrectly but consistently for some period of time. With the increasing use of computerised data bases that can be cross-referenced, the need for fixing such metastable names for purposes of information retrieval will steadily diminish.

The suppression of *Conus anabathrum* Crosse would, we feel, endorse the uncritical perpetuation of previously published taxonomic opinions, accurate or not, without reference to primary type material. Although recognition of *Conus anabathrum* will upset existing usage to some extent, the nomenclature of the genus *Conus* is so confused at this time that only major taxonomic revisions will achieve real stability.

References

Cernohorsky, W. O. 1987. *Conus floridanus* Gabb, 1869 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): proposed conservation of the specific name. *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, **44**(1): 21–22.

Coomans, H. E., Moolenbeek, R. G. & Wils, E. 1980. Alphabetical revision of the (sub)species in recent Conidae. 3. *albus* to *antillarum* with the description of *Conus algoensis agulhasi*, nov. subspecies. *Basteria*, **44**: 17–49.

Crosse, H. 1865. Description de Cones nouveaux provenant de la collection Cuming. *Journal de Conchyliologie*, **13**: 299–315.

Gabb, W. M. 1869. Description of a new cone from the coast of Florida. *American Journal of Conchology*, **4**(4): 195–196.

Smith, E. A. 1884. Mollusca [in] *Report on the Zoological Collections made in the Indo–Pacific Ocean during the voyage of H.M.S. 'Alert'*, pp. 487–508.

Tomlin, J. R. Le B. 1937. Catalogue of recent and fossil cones. *Proceedings of the Malacological Society of London*, **22**: 205–333.

Vink, D. N. L. 1985. What price stability? The vexing problem of synonymy. *Hawaiian Shell News*, **33**: 3–4.

Comments on the proposed suppression for nomenclature of three works by R. W. Wells and C. R. Wellington

(Case 2531: see BZN **44**: 116–121 and 257–261)

(1) G. J. Ingram & J. Covacevich
Queensland Museum, P.O. Box 300, South Brisbane, Queensland 4101, Australia

We strongly support the case by the President of the Australian Society of Herpetologists for suppression of three works of Wells & Wellington for the purposes of nomenclature.

As taxonomists who work on both amphibians and reptiles, we are perturbed by the number and kinds of changes proposed for these groups. We are also disturbed by the potential success of Wells & Wellington's attempt to 'overload the system'. Through these works the authors have the opportunity to transform taxonomists working on Australian amphibians and reptiles into nomenclatural drudges for many years. It appears that Wells & Wellington have challenged the foundations of nomenclature and, in so doing, set out to test the efficacy of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

We urge the Commission to suppress the works, to avoid two major problems we can foresee:

(1) taxonomists will be forced to make nomenclatural decisions by examining many holotypes and lectotypes designated, but not seen, by Wells & Wellington.

(2) the Bureau of Flora and Fauna, Canberra, intends the *Zoological Catalogue of Australia* to cover all the zoological groups. As each volume is produced, the groups covered will become vulnerable to the same nomenclatural catastrophes that may befall herpetology.